

REMARKS

Claims 2 and 8 have been canceled. Claims 3-6 and 9-12, and amended claims 1, 7, and 13-15 are in this application.

The Examiner stated that the title is not descriptive and that a new title is required. The Examiner also suggested a new title. In response, the title has been revised herein to incorporate the title suggested by the Examiner.

Claims 1, 6, 7, 12, 13, 14, and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee (U.S. Patent No. 6,463,428) in view of Arsenault (U.S. Patent No. 6,925,650).

Amended independent claim 1 recites in part the following:

"in which said first extraction unit is operable to make a whole title character string or strings in which character strings registered in the keyword dictionary for titles are included within a respective program title or titles a keyword extraction objective or objectives, substitute by a space or spaces a portion or portions of a character string or strings which are designated in an exclude character string dictionary for titles within a title or titles which are made to be a keyword extraction objective, and extract a keyword from the title character string or strings which went through a extraction process."

In explaining the above 103 rejection with regard to claim 1, the Examiner appears to assert that Lee and, in particular, lines 29-35 of column 2 thereof discloses the first extraction unit of claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that such portion of Lee does not appear to disclose the above features of claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested

that claim 1 is distinguishable from the applied combination of Lee and Arsenault.

For reasons similar to or somewhat similar to those previously described with regard to claim 1, it is also respectfully submitted that amended independent claims 7 and 13-15 are also distinguishable from Lee and Arsenault as applied by the Examiner.

Claim 6 is dependent from independent claim 1. Accordingly, it is also respectfully submitted that dependent claim 6 is distinguishable from Lee and Arsenault as applied by the Examiner for at least the reasons previously described.

Claims 2, 4, 8, and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Arsenault as applied to claims 1 and 7 above, and further in view of Berger (U.S. Patent No. 6,415,099).

As previously indicated, claims 2 and 8 have been canceled. Claims 4 and 10 are dependent from one of independent claims 1 and 7. Accordingly, it is also respectfully submitted that dependent claims 4 and 10 are distinguishable from Lee and Arsenault as applied by the Examiner for at least the reasons previously described. The Examiner does not appear to rely on Berger to overcome all of the above-described deficiencies of Lee. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 4 and 10 are distinguishable from the applied combination of Lee, Arsenault and Berger.

Claims 3 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Arsenault as applied to claims 1 and 7 above, and further in view of Fleming (U.S. Patent No. 6,449,766).

Claims 3 and 9 are dependent from one of independent claims 1 and 7. Accordingly, it is also respectfully submitted that dependent claims 3 and 9 are distinguishable from Lee and Arsenault as applied by the Examiner for at least the reasons previously described. The Examiner does not appear to rely on Fleming to overcome all of the above-described deficiencies of Lee. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 3 and 9 are distinguishable from the applied combination of Lee, Arsenault and Fleming.

Claims 5 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Arsenault as applied to claims 1 and 7 above, and further in view of Kanungo (U.S. Patent No. 5,870,084).

Claims 5 and 11 are dependent from one of independent claims 1 and 7. Accordingly, it is also respectfully submitted that dependent claims 5 and 11 are distinguishable from Lee and Arsenault as applied by the Examiner for at least the reasons previously described. The Examiner does not appear to rely on Kanungo to overcome all of the above-described deficiencies of Lee. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 5 and 11 are distinguishable from the applied combination of Lee, Arsenault and Kanungo.

As it is believed that all of the objections and rejections set forth in the Official Action have been overcome, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicants' attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections and/or rejections which the Examiner might have.

Application No.: 10/523,332

Docket No.: SONYJP 3.3-317

If there are any charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: February 27, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Dennis M. Smid, Esq.

Registration No.: 34,930

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorney for Applicants

852482_1.DOC